

Art Unit 2151
Serial No. 09/918,666

Reply to Office Action of 04/28/2005
Attorney Docket No.: K35A0872

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful and thoughtful examination of the present application. By way of summary, Claims 1, 2, 10-14, 22, 23, 31-35, 43, 44 and 52-56 were pending in this application. In this response, the Applicants have not made any claim amendments. Accordingly, Claims 1, 2, 10-14, 22, 23, 31-35, 43, 44 and 52-56 remain pending for consideration.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 10-14, 22, 23, 31-35, 43, 44 and 52-56 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,923,648 (Dutta). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Dutta reference fails to teach every step and limitation of the pending claims.

For example, independent Claim 1 recites "(a) receiving a first component of a document over a first communication channel; (b) receiving a second component of the document over a second communication channel." Dutta does not disclose these two steps.

The Examiner has cited Column 1, lines 28-32 of Dutta, which states that "[t]his invention relates to message store-and-forward communication systems . . . which operate typically over a predetermined, limited number of available communication channels." The Examiner also points out that Dutta teaches that "periods of a length of at least one frame time period are selectively allocated on any of the return channels of the channel group." Col. 4, ll. 19-21. However, these two passages do not suggest that a first component of a document is received over a first communication channel and a second component of the document is received over a second communication channel. These passages simply teach the potential use of multiple channels.

Indeed, Dutta further describes that only one channel is used by the mobile terminal to send user messages: "[t]he hub stores the user information and selectively formats it as the second traffic component of data into the frames for transmission over the TDM forward channel." Col. 2, ll. 28-31 (emphasis added). Dutta teaches that "the

Art Unit 2151
Serial No. 09/918,666

Reply to Office Action of 04/28/2005
Attorney Docket No.: K35A0872

control processor 127 of the mobile terminal 120 compiles user messages for transmission at a designated one of a number of available data rates over the designated return channel 162 or 163." Col. 10, ll. 47-50 (emphasis added). Dutta neither discloses nor suggests receiving a first component of a document over a first communication channel and receiving a second component of the document over a second communication channel.

Independent Claims 22 and 43 are allowable for at least substantially the same reasons given above with respect to Claim 1.

Independent Claim 12 recites "(a) receiving a first component of a document over a communication channel during a first synchronization session; (b) receiving a second component of the document over the communication channel during a second synchronization session." Dutta does not disclose these two steps.

As disclosed in the specification, "[m]obile terminals . . . are typically used to view and manipulate various databases . . . The mobile terminal is typically synchronized when the databases are updated, for example, when the user modifies PIM data on a target computer or when the contents of a web site change." Page 1, ll. 14-18. As would be understood by those skilled in the art, synchronization comprises the process of updating data on a mobile terminal with information on a target computer. For example, as defined by the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, synchronization includes "[i]n handheld computing, the process of updating or backing up the data on a handheld computer to the linked software applications on a desktop computer. Data changes made on the desktop computer may also be copied to the handheld during synchronization." Dutta does not disclose any synchronization sessions, much less receiving a first component of a document over a communication channel during a first synchronization session and receiving a second component of the document over the communication channel during a second synchronization session.

Independent Claims 33 and 54 are allowable for at least substantially the same reasons given above with respect to Claim 12.

Art Unit 2151
Serial No. 09/918,666

Reply to Office Action of 04/28/2005
Attorney Docket No.: K35A0872

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that every pending independent claim incorporates at least one limitation that is not taught or suggested by the prior art, and request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 23, 31, 32, 34, 35, 44, 52, 53, 55 and 56 are dependent upon allowable independent claims and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons given above.

Art Unit 2151
Serial No. 09/918,666

Reply to Office Action of 04/28/2005
Attorney Docket No.: K35A0872


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the rejections. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any required fees associated with this Communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1209.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 20, 2005

By: 
Mifad G. Shara, Esq.
Reg. No. 39,367

WESTERN DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
20511 Lake Forest Drive
Lake Forest, CA 92630
Tel.: (949) 672-7000
Fax: (949) 672-6604